CHAPTER 5

AN EDUCATIONAL PSYCHOLOGY MODEL

1. INTRODUCTION

As soon as a child is identified as someone with developmental problems, which usually are manifested as emotional, behavioral or learning deviations, and the question is asked about how possibly the symptoms can be eliminated, the area of professional educational psychology is entered (Van Niekerk, 1985: 145). Thus, it is clear that educational psychological activities are directed to a **professional field** in which **proficiency** and **skillfulness** are required (Van Niekerk, 1984) and this accentuates the fact that it is a science **directed to the practice** of educating.

As a practically-directed **science**, educational psychology also has to fulfill the requirement of **being scientific** which means the emphasis is on the scientific nature of its work, attitude and method. Its theories have to express a vision of the child, family, school and society. However, its practically-directed scientific activities in the first place are not for the sake of knowledge itself but for the sake of **correct** actions regarding the handling of concrete problems (Van Niekerk, 1985: 146). Also, its theory forming thrives in continual interaction with practice.

Where education and psychology are involved in thoughtfully cultivating and ordering data regarding specific aspects of a **developing** person, orthopedagogics and clinical psychology, as practical perspectives, are involved in thoughtfully cultivating and ordering **relevant** facts regarding the **problems** of a person's (child's) development and **designing activities** to eliminate them. Just as a theory of teaching has little meaning if its foundation is not in the **practice** of a teaching-learning situation, so a theory of psychotherapy has little meaning if it is not rooted in a situation of personal actualization, and similarly a theory of child psychotherapy has little meaning if its basis is not found in a **child's** practical situations of personal actualization.

Where a theoretician tries to disclose strategies that he has not yet mastered and is satisfied if he can describe the phenomenon

categorically, a practitioner especially wants to improve his practice. Thus, he "extends" what he knows to eliminate confusing actions (see Axline, 1977). This knowledge continually requires abstracting, determining strategies, constructing aids etc. and it is a fact that each practice is rooted in a particular theory.

Educational psychology is compelled not only to clarify children's personality deviations but to point out and test the application possibilities of a theory for eliminating such problems in practice. If this does not happen, the practice designed will be haphazard and will remain not much more than a matter of mere contrivances.

Thus, the educational psychologist has to be able to given an account of the theory that is the basis of his practice, and he has to arrive at **generally valid** findings so that the practice itself can be accurately and systematically analyzed. This requirement is inescapable if a foundation is sought for each of the great diversity of assertions, modes and functions (Allen, 1947).

A teacher can be trained to teach via a method. However, without a founding didactic theory he will not be able to design an original lesson and his judgment of his practice, his accountability and his initiative will be lacking.

Understanding and effectively designing a practice for a personality deviant child requires as a first precondition the clarification of such a deviancy in its essentials. Particular aspects alone cannot be concentrated on because such a child does not define himself and behave in terms of particular organic defects, synaptic short-circuits, achievement scores or social deviancies.

Stemming from the above, specific **basic** knowledge of a particular phenomenon is necessary to clarify, understand and master it. Such **scientific** knowledge means a thorough understanding of a particular delimited area of study that is acquired by special methods or modes of attack, and by thoroughly describing, ordering, classifying and, finally, explicating the information by disclosing particular laws or regularities that the data include or a clarification of what is incomprehensible in the knowledge.

Consequently, an educational psychologist first has to have at his disposal **scientifically** accountable knowledge if he wants to make a claim to **expertness**. The scientific character of knowledge is not

determined by its applicability, as such, but rather by its methodological accountability; this does not imply that areas with possibilities of application are less scientific.

Unlocking and mastering his terrain also embraces much more than a **cursory** acquaintance with the contributions of the various professional disciplines, or merely comparing various theories from various origins. In this connection, Harm de Vos warns that "comparing theories, however, brings with it the fact that a few are over-valued and this results in a premature generalization of data and in hind sight it is realized that only a limited value should have been attributed to a particular theory" (De Vos [in Dutch], 1981).

Of necessity, this knowledge has to be related to a child's **humanity** in the sense that as a person he continually actualizes his **intentionalizing, feeling, attending, perceiving, thinking, fantasizing, remembering and remembering** as his ways of being directed to his world.

The educational psychologist studies the **perplexing** appearance of personal development and the dynamics of **educating**. The **categorical** description of **personal** and **educative dynamics** is undertaken respectively by psychology and education and indeed from a so-called "fundamental" perspective. However, in the end this leaves educational psychology with the task of describing the **perplexing** appearance of the **personal** and **educative essentials** with its own **concepts.**

It is apparent, therefore, that the educational psychologist, with his aim of a scientifically accountable description of disharmonious educating and personal dynamics has to link up with those sciences that lay claim to **fundamental** findings regarding these dynamics. In other words, an educational psychologist wants to know and understand a personality-deviant child (behavioral, learning and other deviations) in his particular situatedness in order to help him regarding his being developmentally restrained. His practically directed insights thus have to link up with those basic sciences that try to clarify the phenomenon of a child's development, and it is especially **education** and **psychology** that come to the fore here. In addition, an educational psychologist has to be aware of the findings from each of the other perspectives on a child's development and the deviation, but he has be able to put such results within an accountable evaluative framework and then

incorporate them into his **accountable** model of interpreting them and designing a practice.

The following is a brief reflection on educational psychology linking up education and psychology.

2. LINKING UP EDUCATION AND PSYCHOLOGY

2.1   Introduction

With particular reference to education and psychology, the following correspondences are noted:

> * Both have a **person** as the focus of study and thus have to have a clear image of what is understood by a **person**; and
> * both study a person's **development**.

Presuppositions about their areas of study have to include (see Loch, 1963: 9-10) the following:

> * A person should always be understood in terms of a person himself, i.e., from the phenomena and actions of a person himself;
> * as a meaning giving being, a person remains an open question and cannot be fathomed completely; and
> * one has to proceed from the person as a totality.

Acceptable psychological and educational findings have to concern the **total** person as situated potentiality, as a dialoguing involvement, as directed-to and open for, as a being confronted with ethical, moral, religious demands and as freedom-in-responsibility. Therefore, an interpretation of a person as an "object" in the sense of the natural sciences cannot be subscribed to by an educational psychologist and, therefore, he has to make sure that the notion of a person that he subscribes to is free of any [natural science] metaphysical constructions (Preller, 1974: 85).

Disclosing the essentials of being a person has shown that a person no longer can be compared to a psycho-physical organism or that he functions as a higher animal but rather that he is a valuing being who continually attributes **personal** meaning to his situation. The center for all activities of a human being is a **person** which also is the moving power behind his development. Nel says, "Intentional

directedness, choices, decisions, being addressed by conscience, feeling guilt, all are embedded in a primordial, affective foundation as an inseparable part of a person's existence" (Nel [in Afrikaans], 1968: 18-19). In addition, he (Nel, 1968: 36) says that psychology and education really encounter each other in a genetic anthropology, i.e., under the viewpoint of the development of a human **child**, thus in a psychology of becoming (development). Consequently, education and psychology have to link up with philosophical anthropology as that endeavor that involves itself with a scientifically accountable description of what a person is and with establishing an accountable view of a person (see Van Niekerk, 1976: 24-26).

If an educator or a psychologist ignores a person as a **meaning giving** being, he cannot be accepted out of hand by educational psychology because he leaves out of consideration what really sustains a person's unacceptable activities and unfavorable development.

As a **practically directed educator** and a **practically directed psychologist**, an educational psychologist has to form an idea for himself of the theories of each of these basic sciences for designing his own understanding and practice so that he can arrive at **generally valid** conclusions regarding the various current explanations, modes and functions which can arise regarding developmental restraints.

Basic knowledge about human deviancy does not fall only within one subject area. It is generally accepted that the interactions among family restructuring, evaluating, educating, teaching, supporting services and medical care significantly influence a person's development. This suggests that combinations of subject areas can serve as a foundation, especially when differentiated aims are formulated. However, there has to be a link with the basic scientific findings that explicate a **child** as a person-in-totality in his relationship with reality and although it is not only the educator or psychologist who figures here, it is mainly these two disciplines that are in the foreground.

As a basic science, education reflects on the reality of educating which it analyzes and describes. However, teaching methodology and orthopedagogics are practically directed perspectives on educating. Each has to establish its own founded theory for

designing a practice because in the absence of this foundation they will not be able to proceed to an original design and their practical pursuits will be characterized as mechanistic because judgment and practical accountability will then be left hanging in the air.

As a basic science which a research psychologists involves himself with, [phenomenological] psychology interprets the dialogue of a person with his world (Van den Berg and Linschoten, 1969: 6), i.e., a **person** establishing (world) relationships and he furnishes categorical findings about "personality", "personality structure", "personal functioning", "personal growth", "personal development", "consciousness", "intellectual abilities", "dispositions", "interests" and more. Therefore, some conclude that the name "psychology" ought rather to be replaced by "**personology**". Since "applied psychology" is differentiated into industrial, clinical, educational and counseling branches, each has a practically directed perspective on a **person** in his dialogue with his world. In linking up with the **categorical** findings of "general psychology" each applied area also has to provide **founded** ideas about designing its practice, especially with reference to using **permissible** methods, techniques, etc.

The clinical or counseling psychologist who, for example, assumes that the success of his practical activities is mainly determined by the nature and depth of the human contact between him and his patient does not respond to the demand of being scientific (Preller, 1974: 85). Therefore, each practicing psychologist's adherence to a recognized framework of designing a practice has to be able to be scientifically accounted for, otherwise, as Van den Berg (1960) says, he primarily "knows" without his science.

The educational psychologist must not be guilty of isolating and absolutizing one or more particular aspect of human life and then use it or them as the foundation of his theoretical framework and in accordance with which the whole of human existence then is interpreted following particular **proposed** "generally accepted" presuppositions. Preller (1974: 85) says if one wants to be responsive to the demands of modern **scientific practice**, the primary emphasis has to be on the scientific nature of the work, attitude or methodology. Reality needs to be seen as a meaning-loaded reality and consciousness as intentionality.

From the above it appears that educational and psychological insights have to serve as a basis for an educational psychological practice as a practice attuned to helping a child with personality developmental concerns, in general, and disturbances, in particular.

The educational psychologist has to refrain from vague generalizations regarding the relation between educating and emotional problems, personality and other problems of the parents, social psychological factors such as marital problems, ignorance about educating, alcoholism and drug use, a combination of physical and emotional problems, etc. The essentials regarding a child actualizing his personality in relation to each factor has to be indicated. The real **effect** of educating on a child's personality development has to be identified. Simple causes offered for particular behavioral and other deviations such as, e.g., "He is not intelligent"; "He is lazy"; "He has emotional problems because his parents are separated"; "He is restrained by his milieu" are really of little value.

The direct connection between the disharmonious dynamics of educating which have played a particular role with a particular personality deviant child and the present structure of various dimensions of his personality have to be elucidated. Harm de Vos states with relevance, "Although the medical and psychological aspects cannot be omitted in diagnosis and assistance, in our time the pedagogic and social aspects have acquired a primary accent" (De Vos [in Dutch], 1981).

Thus, in order to penetrate to the essentials of personality deviancy there has to be a search for the real **effects** of educating in this respect in order to explicate how a particular disposition or deviancy of a particular child has arisen. Certainly one has to be able to determined how a child's educative involvement really effects his personality development with regard to his basic developmental needs such as, e.g., basic trust in contrast to its lack; understanding versus not understanding; independence in contrast to dependence, the need for love and security; and what the effects are when there is educative failure in providing for a child's needs.

This confronts educational psychology with the task of comprehensively integrating diverse insights which means developing a convergent perspective.

2.2 The task for educational psychology of developing a convergent perspective

2.2.1 Introduction

From the above it is clear that educational psychology can only explicate the phenomenon of deviancy, in light of which corrective techniques and methods can be designed, from a comprehensive perspective on personality development. Therefore, in the first place, regarding the moments of developmental restraints, the educational psychologist is confronted with a task of convergence because he has to be able to select, specify and use, in intervening with the deviant child, each distinguishable perspective on a child's development which can be discerned.

To make these connections it is obvious that there has to be a convergence or integration of all of the pedagogic part perspectives and relevant psychological insights; in other words, the relevance of the various perspectives with respect to a child's personal structure and development have to be determined, explicated and interpreted by the educational psychologist (see Steele and Pollock, 1968: 58-61).

2.2.2 The contributions of psychology

Psychology has already established an extensive body of knowledge regarding the personality deviant child. It also has shown that a child's personal development includes an **elevation in meaning** because, on the basis of its cumulative nature, original affective, cognitive and normative meanings are actualized and then again interwoven with subsequent meanings. The essences of a **person** have already been particularized to a greater or lesser degree. Especially developmental psychology, in addition to educational psychology, has considerably clarified a child's development as involving continual change. Knowledge of a child's personal actualization as this manifests itself during different periods of life also is available in the findings of a variety of psychologists (see Bloom, 1964; Bollinger, 1967; Erikson, 1959; Frankl, 1968 and 1967; Freud, 1967; Jones et al., 1971; Kagan and Haverman, 1970; Kohlberg, 1969 and 1975; Piaget, 1968; Scott, 1986; Straus, 1963 and Van den Berg, 1969).

Especially, the practically directed psychological perspectives also have established a variety of sophisticated evaluation and intervention procedures that are indispensable components for analyzing and eliminating personal deviancies. Since it is necessary to continually analyze and determine the personal potentialities and their actualization by a particular deviant child, the entire field of psychological testing is entered, i.e., all procedures for obtaining a valid and reliable person image. In addition, there has to be a linking up with intervention procedures that involve the entire spectrum of psychotherapy and related procedures (see Part III).

2.2.3 The contributions of education

The fact that, as a developing person, a child continually wants to be someone himself (Langeveld, 1952: 142) does not mean that he also knows **how** and **what** he will become and it is an onticity[*] that he is committed to **being educated** (Langeveld, 1952: 165), and that the adult cannot be eliminated from his life because of his helplessness, need for and seeking of support.

The reality of educating has already been described in depth macrostructurally through various pedagogic perspectives, e.g., from fundamental pedagogic, psychopedagogic, didactic pedagogic, orthopedagogic and other pedagogic perspectives (see Kohnstam, 1952; Langeveld, 1952; Gunter, 1977, 1981; Landman and Roos, 1973; Landman, 1981; Kok, 1982; Loch, 1963; Nel, 1967, 1968; Sonnekus, 1970; Sonnekus and Ferreira, 1979; Sonnekus et al., 1973; Oberholzer, 1968; Perquin, 1962; Roth, 1959; Van der Stoep, 1968; Van Niekerk, 1976, 1980, 1982, 1984, 1985).

According to Langeveld (1952: 142) an educator has to guide a child not only to live but also to want to live as the being that he is. He cannot be and give meaning [as he should] without the help of his educators. Therefore, development [becoming] occurs by a child **expanding his meanings** in an educative situation as long as he is a **child.** This is a fact that no one can deny or ignore who has knowledge of the anthropological[*] foundation of these conclusions.

---

[*] An essential characteristic of being human.
[*] Philosophical anthropology and not the social science of anthropology.

A child continually **gives meaning** to the educative relationship, aim, sequence and activity structures in which he participates with his educators.

As a **basic** science, pedagogics has particularized the essentials of educating and shown clearly their relationships to a child's personal actualization and development. Educating is primarily a matter of a personal relationship that acquires concrete form in affective and cognitive ways. In his giving meaning to the multiply structured world (spatial, temporal, formal, social, etc.) a child continually broadens his experiential world but the world itself also acquires for him a formal-functional meaning. Consequently, he discovers that whether he feels, perceives, thinks remembers, etc. effectively or not promote or restrain the ways he broadens his knowledge and emotional dispositions. Thus the formal aspect also becomes functional: the possibility of being dynamically involved in a continually changing world is that as he develops he feels and knows more and thus becomes better "equipped" and more "functional" or perhaps less so.

By means of **acting**, an educator and child stand together in an educative relationship within which the adult discloses himself as a person and creates a climate that can promote or dampen a child's personal actualization. However, a child also contributes to this relationship, climate and involvement with the situation. Thus, this is a **functional** event that points to the **effects** of **both** party's **activities** regarding the child's giving affective, cognitive and normative meaning. This educative functionality always is evident when the structures of educating are appropriately implemented.

During each educative event **all** of its structures are implemented and these essentials of educating always are interrelated. However, there are no educative events or moments of personal actualization unless the essentials of **both** are involved and each educative event is unique and is determined by the educator's and the child's **functional** participation in it by means of **personal** activities.

A child's development does not occur automatically because, among other reasons, the dynamics of educating imply separate activities of the educator and child which are executed in unison but which possibly can proceed inadequately. Indeed, it is generally acknowledged that the structures of educating can be implemented **disharmoniously** in a particular educative situation and then such

activities of the educator and child are **educatively dysfunctional.**

If a child attributes unfavorable affective and cognitive meanings this usually comes across in his behaviors and usually implies emotional, behavioral, learning or other deviations of some nature. Thus, when the educative structures are not actualized properly, a child is neglected affectively, cognitively and normatively and his prospering as a person is impeded.

When the dynamics of educating are disharmonious, this is an event where the essentials of educating appear confused because of the dysfunctionality of the educative activities of the educator and child. Then a child's personal development is inadequately actualized under the guidance of an adult and he becomes conspicuous because his behavior is in harmony with the unfavorable meanings that he gives on emotional, knowing and normative levels to himself and to life contents, and his behavior is not in harmony with what can be expected of him according to his developmental level and personal potentialities.

Orthopedagogics concentrates on disclosing and elucidating the disharmonious dynamics of educating and on establishing guidelines for designing an educatively harmonizing practice.

From the above it is clear that educational psychology has to begin from educational, psychological and clinical psychological foundations in order to provide a basic theory to explain individual differences among deviant children in their unique educative situatedness, after which strategies for providing assistance can be designed and carried out.

2.2.4   Accomplishing the convergence

2.2.4.1   Introduction

In the current literature the connection between educational and psychological insights usually are formulated merely as "afterthoughts" in terms such as " ... the late maturing boy needs help in developing confidence and assurance" (Sprinthall and Sprinthall [in English], 1977: 85) or " ... as the twig is bent, so grows the tree" (Sprinthall and Sprinthall [in English], 1977: 91).

A close examination of how these pronouncements might be relevant in designing a practice indicates that they are meaningless clichés. They do not indicate **what** the adult's "emotional assurance" involves, or what "late maturing" implies and they suffice in making vague generalizations about the relations among educating and emotional problems, social-psychological factors, marital problems, alcoholism, drug use, physical problems, etc. Nowhere are the relevant essentials of the **educative dysfunctionality** regarding the child's **personal underactualization** indicated.

This emphasizes the irrefutable fact that educational psychology has to strictly accept its **task of converging theory and practice** if it is not to be guilty of fragmenting and of offering simplistic causes of particular behavioral, learning and other deviations located only in a child's personality or only in the family framework.

2.2.4.2   Theory convergence

To penetrate to the essentials of a child's personal deviancy the true effect of **dysfunctional** educating has to be indicated in terms of a macrostructural specification of how particular dispositions or deviant behaviors arise with reference to a response to his personal needs.

This compels the educational psychologist to start by converging the **relevant** insights of all of the pedagogic perspectives. Everything that for him is relevant to a child's participating in educating, the effect of educating and more, a child's personal structure, personal actualization and personal development have to be delimited, elucidated and explicated (Steele and Pollock, 1968: 58-61).

Therefore, educational psychology has to remain a scientific discipline that is **aware of essentials** and it has to insure the validity of the macrostructures advanced by the various "basic" perspectives that he enlists with the aim of necessarily maneuvering or refining them in his own specialized practice. Such a macrostructural convergence, however, includes little more than generalized insights and this presents the educational psychologist with the task of eliminating vagueness in his own **particularizations.** Deviancy and educative disharmony have to be particularized in their dynamic relationships and out of that, for

example, aggressiveness, insecurity, emotional disturbance and more, on the one hand, and over-protection, rejection, mistrust, etc., on the other hand, have to be interpreted as matters of educational psychology.

This scientific work then elevates educational psychology to a full-fledged academic perspective along with other practically directed educational and psychological perspectives. As part of its theoretical work, then, educational psychology also has to indicate how it can arrive at a reliable and valid selection of macrostructures in order to determine the particularities of what is underactualized.

Within this particularization, the distinction between **theory** and **practice** are also indicatable. In so far as the practicing educational psychologist is called to practice, he is really called to particularize in one way or another psychological and educational macrostructures. Therefore, he necessarily has to be conversant with the pedagogic categories and how they are reciprocally related to each other. In addition, he also has to have thorough knowledge of psychological macrostructures and also be able to show categorically how a child's personal actualization and development are influenced by the way he is being educated.

The professional educational psychologist whose theoretical frame of reference proceeds haltingly and who yet lays claim to designing an effective practice has to be diagnosed as someone who suffers from a professional superiority complex (Van Niekerk, 1985) who, as in such cases, cannot effectively master his terrain.

2.2.4.3   Practice convergence

From the above it is clear that to design an effective practice it is necessary to find links between the essentials of the deviancy and available knowledge about designing practical strategies.

The educational psychologist, in designing a practice, as does any other practice-directed pedagogue or psychologist, has to begin with a macrostructural description of a child's personal development. This requires making a macrostructural description of educating and a **micro-analysis** of what appear as perplexing personal essences in relation to perplexing essentials of educating after which there again is a macrostructural description of the personal deviancy **as such** and of the particular child in terms of his

inadequately attributed meanings, as developmental and learning restraints, and this reveals the **essential characteristics** of the disharmonious educative and teaching dynamics of this child.

The convergence in practice implies that the professional educational psychologist has to determine the most relevant educative essentials, as disharmonious moments, in relation to the inadequate appearance of the essentials of the child's psychic life and their mutual and dynamic interwovenness with his conspicuous behaviors.

Therefore, it has to be determined with some **certainty** how a child's educative involvement based on dysfunctional educative relationships really keeps his personal development in check because of an inadequate acknowledgment of his unique, basic personal needs such as, for example, a lack of trust, misunderstanding, dependency, etc.; what the effect is of inadequate physical circumstances; environmental restraints; socio-economic circumstances; the national or cultural group to which he belongs. The cardinal question is **what** are the **controllable** and **eliminatable** personal **disturbances** and **disturbing moments** and **how ought** they to be neutralized or **corrected**.

Because there **always** is a direct relation between the disharmonious dynamics of educating in which a particular deviant child has participated and his personal structure, the mutual relations among **distinguishable** factors of personal deviancy have to be indicated as well as **what** the direct connection is between the generally accepted (or supposed) cause and the actual course of his personal development in relation to the disharmonious educative dynamics resulting from dysfunctional educative activities.

Once there is a degree of certainty regarding the pedagogic and psychological macrostructures proposed and thus the essentials of the disharmonious educative dynamics and inadequate personal actualization (development) are represented, it is determined how they are mutually interrelated in terms of dysfunctional educative activities, as well as a child's attribution of unfavorable affective and cognitive meanings and his unacceptable behavior. That is, dysfunctional activities and the child's resulting unfavorable meanings have to be gauged.

Diagnosing determines the essentials of a particular child's deviancy and specifies **where** the essentials of educating appear to be confusing in relation to the perplexing appearances of his psychological essentials, all with appropriate reference to educative dysfunctionality, a matter considered in the next chapter.

As far as providing assistance, the educational psychologist avails himself of all relevant educative procedures, therapeutic techniques and other procedures of intervention to **harmonize** the disharmonious dynamics of educating, which includes modifying unfavorable meanings and "normalizing" a child's behaviors (see Part III).

2.2.5 Synthesis

From the above it is clear that **educational** and **psychological** insights have to provide the **basis** for an accountably designed educational psychological theory and practice. However, when an educational psychologist "links together" educational and psychological findings, this implies that not **all** of them can simple be accepted. These insights have to be reflectively and accountably incorporated into a unique theoretical **educational** frame of reference in designing his practice.

If this is not done, there will be no further advance beyond merely general talk as can be seen from the following pronouncements where it is usually acknowledged that a child's development and being educated (and thus his deviancy and disharmonious educating) go hand in hand, but the essentials of this problem are avoided:

> * "Adequate emotional development is dependent on family functioning ... because children have need of the adults' encouragement and recognition" (Anderson [in Afrikaans], 1981).

The academic and professional terrain that the educational psychologist has to command requires that he attend to designing a **theory** and **practice** that are based on philosophical anthropological, educational, orthopedagogical, psychological, clinical psychological and counseling psychological foundations. This presents him with the task of converging his perspectives as a theoretician and practitioner. In the name "educational

psychologist" it is alleged that he indeed is dependent on taking his terrain and professionalism seriously so he can make effective judgments about the following tasks that confront him:

* Giving timely guidance to parents and teachers regarding educating, teaching and developing their child as a person;
* intervening, especially with a child and previous adults whose personal actualization indicate problems with the aim of harmonizing the disharmonious and eliminating problems that show themselves in various symptoms such as relationship, family, school, behavioral and learning problems among which underachievement, specific learning restraints, vocational knowledge and vocational choice problems are manifested; and
* providing services to teaching departments, school clinics and auxiliary services, schools for special education and in private practice or other instances where he is a member of an interdisciplinary or trans-professional team.

Components of his framework of expertise include the following:

* Knowledge of the entire spectrum of personal becoming from birth to adulthood;
* knowledge of types of handicaps among which are intellectual, physical, neurological, environmental;
* knowledge of and skill in evaluation and diagnostic procedures in general;
* skill in acquiring a reliable image of a problem in terms of its origins and the nature of its symptoms;
* knowledge of personal deviancy with reference to the influence of disharmonious educating and teaching;
* knowledge of the spectrum of available opportunities and auxiliary services;
* skill in providing services to prevent personal deviancy;
* skill in implementing tests and other procedures to acquire a reliable person image and image of the disharmonious educative dynamics;
* knowledge of the learning event;
* knowledge of careers;
* knowledge of subject, school and occupational choice possibilities;
* knowledge of pursuing [vocational] choices;
* knowledge of and skill in providing assistance; and

* knowledge of providing help in multidisciplinary teamwork.

Thus, an educational psychologist is an **educator** and a
psychologist who converges his two scientific areas and practices
into a unitary perspective [in an educative context].

3. REFERENCES

Allen, F. (1947). **Psychotherapy with children.** London.
Axline, V. M. (1977. **Play therapy.** New York: Ballentine Books.
Bloom, B. S. (1964). **Stability and change in human characteristics.** New York:
Wiley.
Bollinger, H. (1967). **Das werden des person.** Personale Anthropologie I.
Munich: Ernst Reinhardt.
De Vos, H. (1981). Sleutelen ann kinderen--sleutelen aan het onderwijssisteem. In
Onderwijs en Opvoeding. Vol 32 No. 8/9.
Erikson, E. H. (1959). Identity and the life cycle. **Psychological Issues** Vol 1, No. 1.
Freud, S. (1967). **Normality and pathology in childhood.** New York: International
Universities Press.
Frankl, V. E. (1967). **Existentialism and psychotherapy.** New York: Washington
Square Press.
Frankl, V. E. (1968). **The doctor and the soul: From psychotherapy to
logotherapy.** Second Edition. London: Souvenir Press.
Gunter, C. F. G. (1977). **'n Christelike-georienteerde opvoedingsfilosofie.**
Stellenbosch: University Booksellers and Publishers.
Gunter, C. F. G. (1981). **Aspects of educational theory.** Stellenbosch: University
Booksellers and Publishers.
Jones, M. C., Bayley, N., McFarlene, J. W. and Honzik, M. P. (Eds.) (1971). **The course of
human development.** Waltham, Mass.: Xerox.
Kagan, J. and Haverman, E. (1970). **Psychology: An introduction.** New York:
Viking.
Kohlberg, L. (1969). Stages and sequences; The cognitive developmental approach to
socialization.. In Gosslin, D. (Ed.) **Handbook of socialization: Theroy and
research.** New York: Rand McNally.
Kohlberg, L. (1975). The cognitive developmental approach to moral development. **Phi
Delta Kappan,** Vol. 56, No. 10.
Kohnstam, P. H. (1952). **Keur uit het didaktisch werk.** Second Edition. Groningen:
J. B. Wolters.
Kok, J. F. W. (1982). Op weg naar een orthopedagogiek 1. **Pedagogisch Tijdschrift
voor Opvoedkunde,** 7, 194-199.
Landman, W. A. (1981). **Onderwys- en opvoedingsdoelstellings vir die
tagterjare in die Republiek van Suid-Afrika.** University of Pretoria.
Landman, W. A. and Roos, S. G. (1973). **Fundamentele pedagogiek en die
opvoedingswerklikheid.** Durban: Butterworths.
Langeveld, M. J. (1952). **Beknopte theoretische paedagogiek.** Fourth Printing.
Groningen: J. B. Wolters.
Loch, W. (1963). Die anthropologische dimension der paedagogiek. **Neue
Paedagogische Bemuhungen.** Vol. 1, No. 2.
Nel, B. F. (1967). **Antropologiese aanloop tot verantwoorde pedagogiek.**
Stellenbosch: University Publishers and Booksellers.
Nel, B. F. (1968). **Fundamentele orientering in die psigologiese pedagogiek.**
Stellenbosch: University Publishers and Booksellers.

Oberholzer, C. K. (1968). **Prolegomena van 'n prinsipiele pedagogiek.** Cape Town: HAUM.

Perquin, N. (1962). **Pedagogiek.** Sixth Edition. Roermond and Maaseik: JJ Romen and Sons.

Piaget, J. (1970). **Science of education and psychology of the child.** New York: Viking.

Preller, A. C. N. (1974). Is die psigologie 'n wetenskap? **Tydskrif vir Geesteswetenskappe,** Vol. 14, No. 2, 79-88

Scott, J. P. (1986). **Early experience and the organization of behavior.** Belmont:Wadsworth.

Sonnekus, M. C. H. (1970). **Psigologia pedagogica sersum!** Stellenbosch: University Publishers and Booksellers.

Sonnekus, M. C. H., Van Niekerk, P. A., Ferreira, G. V., Van der Merwe, C. A. and Botha, T.R. (1973). **Psigopedagogiek: 'n Inleidende orientering.** Stellenbosch: University Publishers and Booksellers.

Sonnekus, M. C. H. and Ferreira, G. V. (1979). **Die psigiese lewe van die kind-in-opvoeding.** Stellebosch: University Publishers and Booksellers.

Sprinthall, R.C. and Sprinthall, N. A. (1977). **Educational psychology: A developmental approach.** Second edition. Canada: Addison-Wesley.

Steele, B.F. and Pollock, C. B. (1968). A psychiatric study of parents who abuse infants and small children. In Helfer, F. (Ed.) **The battered child.** University of Chicago Press.

Straus, E. (1963). **The primary world of senses.** London: The Free Press of Glencoe.

Van den Berg, J. (1960). **De toekomst der psychologie.** Leiden: Sterfert Kroese.

Van den Berg, J and Linschoten J. (Eds.) (1969). **Persoon en wereld.** Fourth printing. Utrecht: Bijleveld.

Van den Berg, S. G. (1967). Hereditary factors in normal personality traits. **Recent Advances in Biological Psychology.** Vol. 9, 65-104.

Van Niekerk, P. A. (1985). **Die onderwyser en die kind met probleme.** Stellenbosch: Univeristy Publishers and Booksellers.

Van Niekerk, P. A. (1984). Die kundigheid en vaardigheid van die ortopedagoog. **Pedagogiekjoernaal** Vol. 5, No. 1, 142-155.

Van Niekerk, P. A. (1984). Die professionele opvoedkundige-sielkundige: Terreinbeplaning. **Suid-Afrikanse Tydskrif vir die Opvoedkunde,** Vol. 5, No. 3, 144-151.

Van Niekerk, P. A. (1976). **Die problematiese opvoedings-gebeure.** Stellenbosch: University Publishers and Booksellers.